

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates. The cable ownership

cap is a crucial element of our democratic media, and it should not be weakened.

The theoretical possibility of democracy in this media is corrupted when access to forums for "free" speech is controlled by those who set the price. For those who set the price, private profit is the highest (and perhaps only) value upheld.

The rights of citizens are abused by "laws" which erase their voices. There is no "freedom" when a voice that serves a divisive interest is sanctioned for incessant consumption and imposed without any other mitigating criteria than the means to pay a price only possible to the super-rich.

The FCC exists to administer the uses of the publically owned airwaves. Granting use of this medium to only that portion of the public (2 to 5%) who can afford to own nearly all of the broadcasting resources is to sabotage the reason for the existence of an FCC. It is a sabotage of democracy (which, by the way, is not the same thing as "capitalism"; an economic system and not a concomitant element of "democracy"). The myth that capitalism and democracy are one and the same is one of the big mind-muddle lies permeating consciousness as a result of the shanghai-ing of the airwaves by two or three super-rich owners.

I do not even understand why we have to beseech the FCC to do its job. I expect the FCC to function in the capacity of protecting the diversity of media ownership. There is no other reason for their existence. If the FCC functions to serve the purpose for which it was created it can only act to protect the public ownership of the airwaves. Any other act is a betrayal of the office the FCC has been appointed to uphold.